

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 29-34, 47, 49 and 53 are pending. The allowance of claims 1-18, 29-34, 47, 49, and 53 is respectfully acknowledged. Claims 48, 50, and 54 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 48, 50, and 54 are cancelled.

The Examiner issued an Advisory Action and indicated that the proposed amendments in the response filed June 12, 2007 will not be entered. The Examiner considered the request for reconsideration, but the Examiner concluded that the proposed amendment filed June 12, 2007 did not place the application in condition for allowance. The objection to the specification and the rejection of claims 48, 50, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, stand.

Claims 48, 50 and 54 have been cancelled, thus removing the rejection of claims 48, 50 and 54 as a pending rejection. Further, the previously presented arguments regarding the objection to the specification are presented again for the Examiner's consideration. With the cancellation of claim 48, 50 and 54, reconsideration of the arguments regarding the specification objections is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

Lack of Antecedent Basis for the Formula Recited in Claims 5, 14, and 33

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner asserted that the formula recited in claims 5, 14, and 33 lacks antecedent basis in the specification because the formula recited in the claims is broader than the three disclosed particular compounds because the formula of the claims includes compounds where the groups Y_1 and Y_2 are not the groups exemplified in formulas (2) through (4), such as the arylamine, diphenylmethylamine. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner continued to note that Claims 5, 14, and 33 were allowable, but

that the proposed amendments would not be entered. However, these specific amendments were not addressed in the Advisory Action.

By this Amendment, the specification has been amended to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, in particular, the formula recited in claims 5, 14, and 33. Support for the amendment to the specification can be found in the application and, for example, in the originally filed claims which themselves are considered part of the disclosure of the application. Because these amendments to the specification now appear to be the only remaining matter, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul B. Savereide
Registration No. 36,914

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 252-1550